

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,007	10/693,007 10/24/2003		William C. Phillips	1023-284US01	9366
28863	7590	04/05/2006		EXAMINER	
SHUMAK	ER & SII	EFFERT, P. A.	MANUEL, GEORGE C		
8425 SEAS	ONS PAR	KWAY		Laminum I	B + BEB > W 4DEB
SUITE 105				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ST. PAUL,	MN 55125			3762	
				DATE MAILED: 04/05/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/693,007	PHILLIPS ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		George Manuel	3762					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication			ress				
Period for Reply								
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RECHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ISSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by seply received by the Office later than three months after the read patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUN R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mi statute, cause the application to become	IICATION. a reply be timely filed DNTHS from the mailing date of this com ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status		•						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on _							
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
4) 🖂	Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the applica	ition.						
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
-	Claim(s) 23-45 is/are rejected.							
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•						
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers							
9)[]	The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.		•				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).								
a) All b) Some * c) None of:								
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a		ot received.					
Attachmen	t(s)	•						
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	v Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948	Paper N	o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application (PTO-	152)				
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S or No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/12/04, 9/8/05</u> .		or informal Patent Application (PTO- 0/13/05, 12/14/05, 7/2/04.	102)				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-22, drawn to a method for assembling a programmer for a medical device, classified in class 257, subclass E21.001.
- Claims 23-45, drawn to a programmer for a medical device, classified in class 607, subclass 30.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Steven J. Shumaker on 3/23/06 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of II, claims 23-45. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 1-22 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/693,007

Art Unit: 3762

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 23-28, 34, 35, 38-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Mumford et al '360.

Mumford et al disclose a first circuit board comprising alpha numeric display 16, and a second circuit board comprising touch sensitive switch matrix overlay 18. The examiner is interpreting substrate 20 to comprise a second housing member and the structure comprising 24a to comprise a loading port and 20a to comprise a plate member.

Regarding claim 26, the examiner is interpreting circuit board 16 to include telemetry circuitry in unit 88 to be adapted to function with programming head 12.

Regarding claim 27, display 36 comprises a liquid crystal display.

Application/Control Number: 10/693,007

Art Unit: 3762

Regarding claim 28, the examiner is interpreting microprocessor 88 to comprise circuitry to drive the telemetry circuitry comprising head power switch 92 and display circuitry 18.

Regarding claim 39, FIG. 4 shows the overlay 18 being comprised of a plurality of flexible transparent sheets.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 29, 36 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mumford et al '360.

Power for the programming head is provided via the head power switch 92 controlled by the microprocessor system and the high current required for the magnetic coil 60 is provided separately via a mag coil lever 94 located in the console 10. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to disable the display18 during telemetry to conserve battery energy from battery packs 76.

Regarding claim 36, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use a clothing attachment to fix the position of device 12 to the patient so the operator can use his/her hands for providing other patient assistance.

Art Unit: 3762

Regarding claim 45, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to provide an infrared interface for the touch screen because it is well known to use the thermal heat of a programmers fingers for touch screen programming.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mumford et al '360 in view of Wescott '432.

Mumford et al disclose a data entry port comprising alpha numeric keying and touch screen 16 and 18. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use the JTAG teaching of Wescott to adapt the port of Mumford et al with a JTAG port to calibrate the device of Mumford et al.

Claims 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mumford et al '360 in view of Kurjenheimo et al '412.

Mumford et al show all of the features except for housing an internal antenna.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use the compact housing teaching of Kurjenheimo et al to self-contain the circuitry of Mumford et al for ease of manufacture and portability.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Manuel whose telephone number is (571) 272-4952.

G∕orge Manuel Primary Examine